

RECEIVED PAGE 10/12
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
MAR 19 2007

PATENT
Docket No: ST00025USU (SIRF.123USU1)
Serial No.: 09/967,136

REMARKS

Applicant has amended claim 1 in response to the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection and is traversing the other rejections. Applicant believes that no new matter has been added by the above amendments.

35 U.S.C §101 Rejection

The Examiner rejected claim 1 as directed to non-statutory subject matter and claims 2-8 for depending from rejected claim 1. The Examiner asserted that: "The instant claimed invention covers the judicial exception (abstract idea or mathematical algorithm)."

Applicant point out that method claims may use mathematical algorithm and relationships, but may not simply be a mathematical algorithm. Applicant in claim one, claims a process for correlating incoming signals. The element of mathematical processes is used in the claims, but it is not without definition and the claims are not for abstract ideas or mathematical algorithms. Claim one recites:

A method for reducing the number of calculations required to correlate an incoming spread spectrum signal encoded with a pseudorandom code, comprising:

- determining, for the spread spectrum signal, mathematical processes that are repeated in a correlation process;
- removing at least a portion of the mathematical processes that are repeated in the correlation process;
- storing the remaining mathematical processes in a table;
- using the table during the correlation process to determine when a locally generated pseudorandom code and the incoming pseudorandom code are correlated.

Thus, mathematical processes that are used multiple time in determining correlation are identified, and removed with a table being used in place of the repeated mathematical processes.

PATENT
Docket No: ST00025USU (SIRF.123USU1)
Serial No.: 09/967,136

Thus, the mathematical processes are not being claimed in the abstract, rather repeated mathematical processes used in correlation of the signals are claimed as being determined or identified. Therefore, statutory subject matter is present in claim 1 and claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Further, claims 2-8 that depend from claim 1 are also in condition for allowance.

35 U.S.C. §112 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claim 1 and 9-16 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. With regards to claim 1, the Applicant has amended claim one and the rejection is now moot. With regards to claims 9-16, the Examiner asserted that the claims fail to set forth subject matter which Applicant regards as their invention. In claim 9, the Applicant claims:

A spread spectrum receiver, comprising:

means for determining, for an expected incoming spread spectrum signal, mathematical processes that are repeated in a correlation process;

means for storing at least that portion of the mathematical processes that are not repeated in the correlation process in a table, wherein at least a portion of the mathematical processes that are repeated in the correlation process are not stored in the table;

means for using the table during the correlation process to determine when a locally generated pseudorandom code and the incoming pseudorandom code are correlated.

In which, the terms incoming spread spectrum signal is described in the application, examples of mathematical processes are given as an XOR function. Further, On page 7 of the specification, CDMA systems is recited. CDMA systems were well known in the art at the time of filing this application to included transmitters, receivers, and signal processors that correlate signals with PN codes. On page 9 of the specification, Applicant even mentions "correlation used in the related art." Therefore, sufficient disclosure exists to support claims 9-16.

PATENT

Docket No: ST00025USU (SIRF.123USU1)

Serial No.: 09/967,136

With regards to claims 9, the Examiner asserts that "there is no corresponding structure to support the means language. An example of structure that is found in the specification includes a matrix structure. An example of the means for storing includes a table or lookup table that is referenced when correlating the signals. Thus, examples of structures are shown by the applicant.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 9-16 as presented are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks and amendment, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in proper condition for allowance, which such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

THE ECLIPSE GROUP

Date: March 19, 2007

By: 

Gregory B. Gulliver

Registration No. 44,138

The Eclipse Group, LLP

100 Tristate International, Suite 128

Lincolnshire, IL 60069

Phone: (847) 282-3551

Fax: (312) 264-2387

Customer No. 34408